



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,081	11/08/2004	Martin Kreyenschmidt	26098US01CT	2789
22850	7590	04/10/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
COONEY, JOHN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/10/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/512,081

Applicant(s)

KREYENSCHMIDT ET AL.

Examiner

John Cooney

Art Unit

1796

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John Cooney.

(3) _____.

(2) Stefan Koschmieder.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 April 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☒ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes

e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: All.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of "embedded" versus "encapsulate" in the claims. Discussion of "wax" limitation of claim 2. Applicants argued that function of embedded catalyst is different from function of embedded inhibitor. Discussion of lack of weight of limitation associated with group identifier language such as "inhibitor, etc.," and examiner maintained relevance of DE-417's for its teaching of embedding for inhibiting agent effects.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/John Cooney/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.